asserts, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying the event manager as taught by Bonnell as an alert module because the same functionality is achieved.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell does not teach an alert module configured to allow a user to selectively disable (or enable) a display of one or more alerts to the user of the computer, as disclosed in Claim 1 of the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. Thus, the event manager in Bonnell does not teach the alert module as claimed in Claim 1. Nor is there any teaching in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell to achieve the same functionality as the claimed invention. For this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection as to Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2-3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 2-3, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches an alert module with variables that indicate whether each of the alerts is disabled or enabled. The Examiner further states that Bonnell teaches an alert module which records information about the enabled and disabled alerts in a storage medium using an event filter and a system agent.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell discloses a table of consoles (col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 16; Figure 17) which are registered with an agent to receive only certain events from the agent through event filters (Figures 22-23). Each console may also send a registration message to the agent to indicate which types of information the console desires to receive, such as application-level, instance-level or parameter-level information (col. 11, line 17 to col. 12, line 51; Figures 18-20). If a console is not "interested" in receiving certain information from an agent, the agent does not send that information to the console.

Bonnell does not teach an alert module with variables which indicate whether the display of each of the alert notifications to the user is disabled or enabled, as claimed in Claim 2 of the claimed invention. Claims 1-2 have been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention, and Claim 3 is dependent from Claim 1. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In the alternative, there is another reason for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection. In one embodiment of the claimed invention, the alert module (at a user computer) receives all alerts (both enabled and disabled for display) from the agent (at a server computer) and records information about all of the alerts in a storage medium at the user computer for easy access by

B

the user if the user decides to view the alerts. The alert module of Claim 3 records information about the alerts which are disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the user computer.

In contrast, the system in Bonnell uses interest masks, instance interest masks, parameter interest masks and event filters to prevent a console from receiving particular information from an agent (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34). In other words, "events are only reported to interested consoles, and even then only to interested consoles whose event filters are satisfied by the event" (col. 14, lines 7-12). Bonnell does not teach an alert module which records information about the alerts which are disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the user computer. Because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a console from even receiving particular information from an agent, Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claims 4-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 4-5, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a log module configured to store information about the enabled and disabled alerts, including a name of a component associated with one of the alerts using a "Knowledge manager database" and event filters. It is unclear whether the Examiner meant the manager's knowledge database 47 (Figures 2 and 13) or the knowledge database manager 46 (Figures 2 and 13) disclosed in Bonnell, but under either interpretation, Bonnell fails to teach the claimed invention.

First, Bonnell fails to teach a log module configured to store information about alerts which are enabled or disabled by the user for display to the user. Claim 4 is dependent from Claim 1, which has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested. Second, Bonnell fails to teach a log module at the user computer to store information about alerts detected by an agent and are either enabled or disabled for display. Claim 4 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested. If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the

B

103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Claim 5 is dependent from Claim 4, which has been amended. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6-7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 6-7, the Examiner asserts that Bonnell teaches a log module which stores a recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts and a user interface which directs the selection of the alerts by providing a description of the alerts using a graphical interface module.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 4, which has been amended to clarify a log module at the user computer configured to store information about alerts detected by an agent and enabled or disabled for display to the user. As to Claim 7, Bonnell does not teach a user interface which allows a user to select one or more alerts for display to the user by providing a description of the alerts. Claim 7 has been amended in accordance with amended Claim 1 to clarify the selection of alerts by the user for display to the user. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 8-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 8-12, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a user interface which is configured to enable selected alerts in response to an enable command or disable selected alerts in response to a disable command, wherein the alerts are displayed in an alert notification window that is configured to display the name of a component associated with one of the alerts. The Examiner further states that Bonnell teaches an alert notification window which is configured to display a recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts using a graphical user interface.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As explained above with respect to Claim 7, Bonnell does not teach a user interface which allows a user to select one or more alerts for display to the user by providing a description of the alerts. Claims 8-9 are dependent from Claim 7, which has been amended in accordance with amended Claim 1 to clarify the selection of alerts by the user for display to the user. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

For Claim 10, Bonnell does not teach or suggest an alert notification window which displays alerts, which were not selectively disabled for display by the user, to the user. Claim 10

B

has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. Claims 11-12 are dependent from Claim 10, which has been amended. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a first computer configured to generate a notification regarding the status of at least one component of the first computer, wherein the notification comprises a first code having a first data length. The Examiner further asserts that Bonnell teaches a status module in a second computer which is configured to receive the notification from the first computer and to transform the notification into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bonnell does not teach a status module (in a second computer) which transforms a notification having a first data length (from a first computer) into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length. In fact, Bonnell does not teach or suggest a notification having a first data length which is greater than, less than or equal to the data length of a user-friendly display message.

The Examiner states that Bonnell discloses a manager software system which keeps a record of various occurrences throughout the computer network, including the occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution. But there is nothing in Bonnell to suggest a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention in Claim 13. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 14-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 14, the Examiner asserts that Bonnell teaches a first computer and a second computer connected by a computer network. Claim 14 is dependent from Claim 13. As described above with respect to Claim 13, Bonnell does not teach a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

B

As to Claim 15, the Examiner takes "'Official Notice,'" without citing any specific prior art reference, that the concept and advantages of using Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) transactions in a network is notoriously well known in the data communication network art. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying transactions using SNMP for communications between agent software 36 and manager system software 34 and for remote monitoring and updating of devices in the network.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell to use SNMP for communications between agent software 36 and manager system software 34. In fact, Bonnell teaches away from using SNMP for communications between agent software 36 and manager system software 34. Bonnell states "an SNMP system is inefficient and inflexible in that a console must request information from the agent about objects on a piecemeal basis, one request per piece of information, causing increased network traffic as well as overhead in the computer system running the console" (col. 6, lines 10-14). For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Second, Claim 15 is dependent from Claim 13. As described above with respect to Claim 13, Bonnell does not teach a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Thus, even if it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying transactions using SNMP for communications between agent software and manager system software and for remote monitoring and updating of devices in the network, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention of Claim 13. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claims 16-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 16-21, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed invention wherein the first code contains an index which is used by the status module to

B

identify user-friendly display messages; wherein the index is predefined by a management information base; wherein the management information base associates information about said component with the index; and wherein the status module uses the information about the component from the management information base to generate the user-friendly message.

The Examiner, however, takes the position that Bonnell discloses a knowledge module parser 44, a knowledge module 38, a knowledge database manager 46, a database 47, a manager software 34 and an event manager 52 which perform the same functionality as the index. The Examiner further asserts, without citing any specific prior art reference, that the use of an index that points to a base of information is well known in the data processing art and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying an index in the event reported to the management console.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 16-21 are dependent from Claim 13. As described above with respect to Claim 13, Bonnell does not teach a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Moreover, the knowledge module parser 44, knowledge module 38, knowledge database manager 46, database 47, manager software 34 and event manager 52 disclosed in Bonnell do not perform the same functionality as the index, which is used by the claimed invention to identify a user-friendly display message. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention of Claims 16-21. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 22-29 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner takes the position that Claims 22-29 and 34 do not teach or define any new limitations in view of Claims 1-21 and are rejected for similar reasons.

For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1-21 above, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of Claims 22-29 and 34 is respectfully requested. Moreover, for Claims 22-24, Bonnell does not teach an alert module in a second computer wherein the alert module accesses a management information base to transform an alert (from a first computer) comprising an index into a user-friendly display message.

B

In addition, Claims 25 and 28 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Claim 26 has been deleted. Claims 29 and 34 has been amended to correct grammatical errors. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner stated that the rejection of Claims 1-29 and 34 are fully applied to Claims 30-33. In addition, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation wherein one of the alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit. The Examiner, however, takes the position that Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit for equipment at network sites. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Giorgio so that various parameters are monitored. The Examiner states that one would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Giorgio discloses a network manager which sends a request to a microcontroller, and the microcontroller responds to the request by transferring values monitored by the microcontroller to the network manager (Abstract; Figure 5; col. 6, lines 2-5; col. 8, lines 21-23). Giorgio does not teach an agent sending alerts to a manager.

Claims 30-33 are dependent from Claim 25. Neither Bonnell nor Giorgio teach (1) a computer configured to generate a plurality of alerts which are associated with status information of the computer's components; (2) a display executing in a manager computer, wherein the display is configured to allow a user to select at least two of the alerts; and (3) an alert manager module executing in the manager computer, wherein the alert manager module is configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of selected alerts in response to a single command from the user. Thus, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to promptly resolve any such issues.

B

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/6/99

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 235-8550

G:\DOCS\ACC\ACC-1083.DOC
042599

B